





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2016

<https://archive.org/details/lettertoherbertm00clar>

A

# LETTER

TO

HERBERT MARSH, D.D. F.R.S.

&c. &c. &c.

In Reply to certain Observations

CONTAINED IN HIS PAMPHLET

RELATIVE TO

*The British and Foreign Bible Society.*

---

By EDWARD DANIEL CLARKE, LL.D.

---

“ He would not pretend to place himself on a level with that gentleman, either in natural endowments or literary attainments, but on this point he should have no fear fully to meet his objections, to which a complete answer might be given even by a *child*, provided only that *child* were a christian.”

*Speech of Lord Francis Osborne,  
Thursday, Dec. 12, 1811.*

---

CAMBRIDGE,  
PRINTED AND SOLD BY FRANCIS HODSON:

SOLD ALSO BY THE BOOKSELLERS OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE: BY  
CADELL AND DAVIES, BOOKSELLERS, STRAND; BY T. PAYNE,  
PALL-MALL, LONDON; &c. &c. &c.

---

1812.

# LECTURE

ON THE HISTORY OF THE

ART OF

TEACHING

IN THE  
UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE  
BY  
THE  
REV. FREDERICK  
M. A. D. D.  
OF  
THE  
UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE

LONDON:

PRINTED BY  
JOHN JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

1825.

THE  
UNIVERSITY OF  
CAMBRIDGE  
PRINTED BY  
JOHN JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

---

N.B. *Dr. MARSH's Pamphlet, consisting only of 80 pages, after having changed its title with every advertisement wherein it was announced, during nearly two months that it was continually promised to the public, at last made its appearance on Monday, January the 27th, at four o'clock P. M.—The same evening the following Reply was finished, and the next morning it was delivered to the Printer.*

---

On the 2nd of January 1847, at 10 A.M. I was  
informed that the ship "Hesperus" had  
just arrived from the coast of Africa, and  
that she had brought with her a large  
quantity of goods, and a number of  
persons, who were to be landed at  
the place where the goods were to be  
disposed of. The goods were to be  
disposed of at the place where the  
goods were to be disposed of.



## ADVERTISEMENT

---

IT is scarcely necessary to premise that the following observations were occasioned by the public introduction of the Author's name \* into a pamphlet, and by animadversion attended with misrepresentation, upon the sentiments he delivered in a public

---

\* This use of the *Author's name*, without his permission, was the more unwarrantable on the part of Dr. Marsh, as the most studied forbearance upon the occasion he alludes to, prevented the writer of this Letter from making any mention of *him*.

There was certainly no reason to justify such reserve, after the public appeal to his writings, both by the Earl of Hardwicke, as Chairman, and by Lord Francis Osborne, Mover of the Resolutions; but in seconding those Resolutions, the Author did not even allude to *his* "*Address*," because that production bore *his name*. In order to bring forward the arguments in circulation against the Bible Society, he was therefore compelled to notice an *anonymous* hand-bill, circulated, not as from an individual, but with a *plural* expression, as from *all* the adversaries of the Bible Society. The circulation of the *Bible alone* is therein stated as "*THEIR OBJECTION*," not as *Dr. Marsh's objection*. However, Dr. M. now claims all the honour of this hand-bill; and of this honour no one would willingly bereave him.

assembly, in furtherance of what he conceived to be a religious duty. Upon a recent occasion, \* Dr. Marsh expressed a determination “*never to decline a Controversy.*” He will therefore be pleased with any thing having a tendency to gratify his favourite passion; but much disappointed if he expect any continuance of it, in the Writer of this Letter.

Having briefly discussed Dr. Marsh’s Pamphlet, in the following pages, it may now be asked, what is it Dr. Marsh is contending for? He says he pleads for the Liturgy † Who has decried the Liturgy? Do the *reports* of the British and Foreign Bible Society *decry* the Liturgy? Do they employ any language which can be interpreted to its disparagement? Has Dr. Marsh read their *reports*? Has he read for example the *seventh report*? If he have, does he recollect the following passage in p. 20, of that *report*; referring to a considerable grant of Bibles and Testaments “to New York, for distribution by the Bible and COMMON PRAYER BOOK Society, under the patronage of Bishop Moore?” Does he recollect the following passage from the address of the said Bible and COMMON PRAYER BOOK Society, in

\* See Letters to Mr. Lancaster, in the Morning Post.

† See Inquiry, p. 45. “*Whoever rejects the Liturgy,*” says he, “*ceases to be a Churchman.*” Did we need a prophet to give us this information?



p.43, of the Appendix to the said *seventh report* ? viz.  
“ And next to the BIBLE which contains his revealed will, those who have established this Society have been accustomed to revere the BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. This book, containing much of the pious sentiment and language which animated primitive martyrs, and in which they poured forth to their God and Saviour, their prayers and praises, was compiled by the care and labour of the Fathers of the Reformation in the Church of England. Universally admired for its simplicity and its pathos, it is acknowledged even by many who reject it, to be an affecting and correct display of evangelical doctrine, and to breathe the pure emotions of the devout soul. WHAT BETTER METHOD THEN CAN BE ADOPTED TO DISSEMINATE THE TRUTHS OF THE BIBLE, THAN BY DISPERSING A BOOK, WHICH, EXHIBITING THESE TRUTHS IN THE AFFECTING LANGUAGE OF DEVOTION, IMPRESSES THEM ON THE HEART AS WELL AS ON THE UNDERSTANDING?”

Now after reading that the British and Foreign Bible Society *did vote* a supply of Bibles and Testaments to a Bible and COMMON PRAYER BOOK Society, and after reading such eulogy on the COMMON PRAYER BOOK in the Appendix to *that Society's Report*, I appeal to all the

*remaining* simplicity in Dr. Marsh's mind, whether such a Society can be justly charged with designing to accomplish as a measure of ultimate utility, **THE OMISSION OF THE LITURGY?** But now comes the most marvellous part of the story—Now Dr. Marsh open wide your eyes, while, after your example, even larger capitals than your own, render prominent the **FACT**—a fact which your concern for the Liturgy and fears for its safety from the machinations of the Dissenters, it is hoped you will *duly appreciate*—that the measure now brought under your notice **WAS PROPOSED BY A DISSENTER.**

So much then in testimony of the respect borne towards our Liturgy, even by Dissenters themselves—so much in testimony of their liberal conduct in opposition to the hostility so unnecessarily manifested towards the Members of that body. Do we become "*worse Churchmen*" by rendering justice to whom justice is so deservedly due? Where then will *justification* be found for the outcry thus raised against them? What is it Dr. Marsh would require of Dissenters before he consents to join with them in the distribution of the Bible? If the Dissenter were to say "*I will circulate a small Tract together with the Bible!*" then might the Churchman answer, as it would be his duty to do, "*and so will I!*" But when they both act upon *equal ground*,

how does it appear that the uncommented Bible would tend rather to the principles of the *Dissenter* than of the *Churchman*? But Dr. M. *seems* pretty plainly to say, or to insinuate, for “men scruple not to *insinuate* what they dare not *assert*,”\* that the Bible *alone*, without comment, HAS A TENDENCY TO MAKE MEN DISSENTERS!!! than which a greater Libel, or grosser insinuation against the established church, or more in unison with the tenets of Dissenters, was never before promulgated. It is usually maintained by *Churchmen* that the foundation of *their* Creed is the pure text of sacred Scripture; every other document being characterized by the unavoidable infirmities of human nature.

Addressing himself to the Clergy, Dr. M. enjoins them to give Prayer Books when they distribute Bibles. Is not this the practice of our Clergy in their respective parishes? and since every parish has its minister, where is the evil to which he so often proposes the application of a *remedy*? Is it that they assist in sending the Bible where they cannot bestow a Prayer-book? Assuredly, this cannot be deemed an evil! Indeed, the main purport of the pamphlet is lost from the view! Where shall we seek for it?

---

\* See Inquiry, p. 26. *Note*. Decent language, methinks, addressed by a *Margaret Professor* to a very Reverend Dean!

Perhaps there is a passage *couched* in his 62d page which may possibly illustrate its object. These are the words. “So long then as the British and Foreign Bible Society retains its present constitution, I can discover *no other remedy for the evil*, than that Churchmen should withdraw from it, and TRANSFER THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS AND THEIR INFLUENCE TO THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE!!!” Of this Society be it added, Dr. Marsh is a member!—That every success may attend its endeavours, is a superfluous wish for a Clergyman to express; but measures of this kind do not seem calculated to promote its best interests. Now, as Churchmen are subscribing, and will, I am persuaded, still further subscribe to the *latter* Society, even though they continue members of the *former*, I see nothing which would be gained by the *one* from a desertion of the *other*. And as such desertion would not be *very gracious*, nor *very wise*, we must adopt Dr. Marsh’s *own* words in application to his *own* remedy—“though it is considered as *effectual*, it is really *worse than the disease*.” (See Dr. M. p. 73.)

As the Author has fashioned his REPLY as nearly as he could to suit the complexion of the “INQUIRY,” it was necessary to blazon the pages in a similar manner, with CAPITAL LETTERS and *Italics*, otherwise an insignificant observation might

sometimes pass off unheeded. "The reader is requested to keep this **FACT** in remembrance, because we shall find it of great importance, when the views of the Society are more particularly examined."

*Trumpington,*  
*January 27, 1812.*







A  
L E T T E R  
§c.

---

DEAR SIR

YOU must excuse me if I avail myself of the privilege of old acquaintance, by indulging a little pleasantry excited in reading your long-promised Anathema upon the Bible Society, and upon our proceedings in the Town-Hall. You have no objection, as I well know, to lay aside Gravity now and then; and, were this not the case, it is not in my nature to discuss mere *verbiage* with solemnity. I have another reason for treating the subject with some degree of levity. It serves to keep us all in good humour, and to steer clear of the sort of language which you have addressed to my friend Mr. Dealtry in the long Note to the 77th Page, when you accuse him\* of “*having stated what he knew to be false.*” This is the more remarkable, as you commended “the amiable spirit of sincere and benevolent Christianity,” manifested by Mr. Vansittart’s Letter,† and charged other advocates of the Bible Society to “*take Lesson*” from its Author.‡ I find, that with reference to Mr. Vansittart,

---

\* Inquiry, Note 45.

† Ibid. P. 13. Note (6.)    ‡ Ibid.

you have the wisdom to consider your different view of the Bible Society as a "MISFORTUNE," and I believe you have by this time discovered, that every one of your friends agree with you in this respect. For my own part, whether you be contented to place me among that number, or not, I entertain the same sentiments, and consider it the greatest misfortune of your literary career: but such cases among Authors, are never hopeless; the loss is retrievable, and knowing your powers to make good the deficiency, I rather come to make merry with you upon the occasion, than to offer compliments of condolence; you are too good a chess-player to consider yourself as *check-mated*, because you have made a *bad move*. Bring out your *Bishops*, and *Castle*!

You have no idea of the consternation your emissaries occasioned in my nursery, previous to the appearance of your pamphlet. It was said that Queen Mary's bonfires were forsooth to be renewed upon the Market-Hill, and that the Dean of Carlisle, Professor Dealtry, myself, and others, were to be burnt as Heretics for our Protestant zeal. It was in vain I urged that as to Heresy, "*the boot was on the other leg*"—that the most preposterous heresy was that which spoke of the injury likely to be created by giving a Bible without a Prayer Book. All this was to no purpose. "*Dr. Marsh's book*," they said, "*was coming out*"—my friends pitied me—the old nurses sat cross-legged to bring me good luck—and no one believed I could escape with a whole skin. Now then as the MOUNTAIN is delivered—and there is no danger of my being swallowed by the *Mouse*,

I am at liberty to notice the use you have thought proper to make of my name.

You have introduced it in allusion to a hand-bill which having been circulated in Cambridge, was noticed by me in the Town-Hall without any reference to the Author's name, and which you now acknowledge to have proceeded from your Pen.\* The original document is now *become so scarce*, that I doubt whether the famous typographical relique of *Wynkin de Worde* be a whit more rare. But it contained the following memorable sentence, stating the objections not of a single individual, but of a set of men, to the Bible Society. No mention is made of *your* objection, but of *their* objections. "Whereas it has been insinuated, that *they* who object to the modern Bible Society object to the distribution of the Bible, it is necessary to reply, that *their* objection is not to the distribution of the Bible, but TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE BIBLE ALONE." This sentence I read to my audience, as containing a plain exposition of the objections made to the Bible Society by its adversaries, when leisurely stated, and in their own words. Not as *your* objections; nor was any mention made of *your name*. You complain of my stopping at the end of the sentence, and you rather cunningly put a comma after the word ALONE, as if the sentence did not end with that word; thereby falling into the very transgression of which you complain. It is a common trick in controversy, and I shall presently shew that you have recourse to

---

\* Inquiry, p. 79. Note.

it again. Let the reader judge for himself. “ But by stopping short at the words BIBLE ALONE, Dr. Clarke was enabled to give a new turn to the expression” (*See Inquiry, P. 26. Note.*) STOPPING SHORT! why where would you have one *stop*, but at the end of a sentence? Now then, let us see whether you do not this *yourself* in a case less warrantable, where there is only a semicolon? “ It is asked, by Dr. Clarke” (*Ibid. p. 23.*) “ whether the light of revelation shall be conveyed through the public Portals of the Temple, or by the Gate belonging only to the *Priests* ;” To this you add, “ if our Reformers were now alive, those *Priests*, &c.” thus making it appear as if I had spoken of the *Reformers*, although the rest of the sentence would have shewn clearly of whom I was then speaking. If I had made a garbled extract, I might have called your remonstrances “ *fair play* ;” or if I had read only half of a sentence, which is what the readers of your pamphlet are instructed to believe was the case,\* you might, perhaps, have had reason to say a false interpretation had been put upon your language; but when I read the whole sentence which maintains that the *distribution of the Bible alone was objectionable*, and considered, as we used to do in good old times, that a *period* was a *full stop*, I surely had a right to begin my comment. The most remarkable part of the business comes now to be stated; that after these hand-bills have been *called in*, an attempt is made to justify this doctrine; and

---

\* *See Inquiry, p. 26. Note.*

you have the hardihood to tell us, *we forget that we are Churchmen*, because we do not countenance your blunders.\* After objecting to the circulation of THE WORD OF GOD, IN ITS PUREST FORM, you qualify the assertion, by adding, that you intend to give it for passport, or as a *companion*, according to your words, *the Liturgy of the Church of England*; although you know or ought to know, that the main purport of the British and Foreign Bible Society, namely, the universal diffusion of the Scriptures, by insisting upon this conditional mode of distribution, would be entirely defeated.—Would the Emperor of Russia, for example, suffer the translation of the Scriptures, in the language of Finland, to be circulated in his Empire, with the Liturgy of the Church of England? Would the Roman Catholics of Ireland suffer the Bible to travel among them, with your *Companion*? Come, come, this is all, as I said before, but mere *Gallimatia*—and so let it pass away!

You seem aware of the glaring inefficacy of your plan as extended to the general circulation of “*a mischief-making Bible*”—and therefore say, you do not address yourself to the universal Church of Christ, but to the Members and Ministers of the established Church; or *Churchmen*, as you call them.† There would be no harm done, you aver,

\* “You forget that you are Churchmen.”

*Inquiry, p. 26, Note.*

† “I am addressing myself to *Churchmen*, in their intercourse with Churchmen, such as the *Clergyman of a parish* has



in giving a Bible *alone*, except by *their* hands; they *must* give away a Prayer-book with the Bible, or else, giving the Bible *alone*, they “*forget that they are Churchmen.*” Write me down for a believer in the “Koran, the Chouking, the Vedam, or the Shaster,” \* if this notion of thine be consistent with the doctrines of our established Church. It is not Protestantism! I know not what it is; but I had rather you had not maintained it. I expressed the same sentiments to you upon a former occasion, and had reason to hope from your great abilities, a better justification of your opposition to the Bible Society, than you have now afforded; having often listened to you with instruction, and being ready to bear testimony to your talents in the words applied to the last of the Fathers by a writer well known to you—“*acutè, graviter, copiose, dilucide, eruditè disputarit.*” Whence then is this falling off, but from “this FACT, which I request the reader to keep in remembrance,” † that THE CAUSE IS RADICALLY BAD. Zeal, spreading with meteoric rapidity, for the annihilation of religious dissention, is the only

---

*with his parishioners.*” (See Inquiry, p. 3. See also p. 9. Note 5.) Then what reference have your remarks to the Bible Society? If you be merely instructing Clergymen in their parish duties, they will tell you they do not require your advice. There is no Clergyman of the established church who does not distribute Prayer Books in his parish, if he distribute any book whatever; and will the performance of this duty be interrupted by his belonging to the Bible Society? If the British Clergy do their duty, all your aim is answered; and if they do not, it is to no purpose that you address them.

\* See Inquiry, p. 69.

† See Inquiry, p. 8.



*evil* of which you complain; and you say “ we have had nothing similar since Peter the Hermit went preaching the Crusade.” \* A more real manifestation of the “ DEUS VULT,” than Peter witnessed, may possibly have suggested to your mind this comparison: and I am ready to confess, that similar feelings, directed to better purposes, have been called into action.

The censure bestowed upon Churchmen for distributing Bibles alone, is surely unusual among us, and requires the aid of all your talents to be tolerated even for an instant. Indeed you seem fully sensible of the immeasurable difficulties † wherein it has involved you; and armed as I am by lessons transmitted from a line of ancestry, who, as Clergymen, were somewhat distinguished in their day, allow me to tell you those difficulties are insurmountable. You may publish pamphlet after pamphlet, and volume after volume, still all your arguments, according to your own position of them, must center upon this point, whether Clergymen, who assist in circulating the Bible alone, over the face of the whole earth,

\* Inquiry, p. 52.

† “ I acknowledge that the arguments for the distribution of the *Bible alone*, are so specious, so popular, so apparently in the spirit of true *Protestantism*, while the arguments for the contrary, &c. ARE EQUALLY DIFFICULT TO EXPLAIN, AND DANGEROUS TO PROPOSE.” See *Inquiry*, p. 8.

See also, p. 53. “ I sincerely lament, that I have the misfortune to differ upon this subject with men of such distinguished abilities, and such acknowledged integrity, that this difference alone is sufficient to excite a distrust of my own opinion. But I

merit the reprobation you have bestowed upon them of having "*forgot that they are Churchmen.*"

The main purport of your very best arguments appears to me to apply solely to the duties of Clergymen in their respective parishes—and there we are perfectly agreed. Where can be the harm you ask \* of giving away a Prayer Book? "as a question proposed to the members of the church."—*None whatever!* We expect much good to result from such distribution, and are as anxious as you can be, to promote it. Visit my parish of Harlton, and distribute as many Prayer Books as you please; the more the better; it will be the first time the extraneous donors and distributors of religious books, ever found out its wants. But supposing one or two among the parishioners should be found naughty enough (which I sincerely hope will not be the case) to reject the Liturgy, is the Clergyman also to deny the poor man a Bible?

---

have considered the subject in all its bearings, and perhaps with more attention, than can possibly be bestowed on it by men in high situations. IT IS OF ALL SUBJECTS, ON WHICH I EVER UNDERTOOK TO WRITE, THE MOST INTRICATE AND PERPLEXED. And, though at various times I have instituted inquiries, which demanded close reasoning and profound thought, I never entered on a subject, which required *so much* penetration, as the present. IT IS A SUBJECT OF SO EXTRAORDINARY A NATURE, that, while orators, whose wisdom never goes beyond the surface, feel competent to decide, there are points in it, which may elude the discernment of the most sagacious and profound."—How much this passage reminds one of "where is the *Wise*, where is the *Scribe*, where is the *Disputer* of this world, &c.!" 1 Cor. 1. 20.

\* Ibid. p. 3.

or does he “*forget that he is a Churchman*,” by putting the Gospel into the hands of those who are willing to receive it? Is this what you conceive to be “*a dereliction of our duty as Churchmen*”—Is this the FACT which you print in such large capitals, involving the omission of the Liturgy in the distribution of the Bible?” If *such* be your exposition of the doctrines of our Church, I shall not scruple to assert, according to the tenor of your own words,\* that we do “*become better Protestants by becoming worse Churchmen*,” and I trust that every Clergyman will join with me in an assertion so hypothetically founded. Professing a zeal for the *Liturgy*, you seem to disparage the BIBLE; urging arguments founded on its inability to support itself; maintaining that when *alone*, it is weak, but when in *company*,† strong. Where is the Protestant that can agree with you in such opinions? After being accustomed from our tenderest years to regard the Bible with reverence; to open that sacred volume with mingled sentiments of awe and of gratitude, as containing all that is necessary for our Salvation, shall a precept go forth to be inculcated in the minds of youth, that the Bible, when *alone*, is incomplete and imperfect? Cease, I beseech you, from observations, which remind us of the “*Heresy*” we have so often sworn to renounce. Your persisting in them will soon call for more powerful reprehension than mine: Voices, thundering out of Sion, will proclaim the inde-

---

\* See Inquiry, p. 18.

† Ibid. p. 4.

*pendence* and *inviolability* of the Bible. Under this persuasion, and this conviction, I have written to you; but my appeal is to *my country*. Although I am well aware that every Church has its *Cardinals*, of all men I was least prepared to expect any thing resembling them in you. Do you recollect the words of the most eloquent writer I ever read, in the warning he gave to all of us upon this subject? "That which I have written is consistent with the principles of an English Protestant, and with the rational and guarded love to my country, which I am bound according to my ability, to warn, to vindicate and to defend." And, as you speak\* of "the dark and intricate passages," you have found "between the portals of the Temple and the Altar, where Pilgrims lose their way," let the "Priests and Ministers of the Lord stand between the porch and the altar" with lamps "well trimmed and burning" to dissipate the gloom, and enable you to walk less tortuously in the Sanctuary. Perhaps you begin to acknowledge that the arguments for the distribution of the *Bible alone* are sometimes "so specious, so popular, so apparently in the spirit of Protestantism," that, to cut the matter short, you know not how to get over them. Can the Bible ever become injurious by its distribution? Never! Never! Never!

As to all that you have inserted respecting your Sermon at St. Paul's, and the compliments paid to it, †

---

\* Ibid. p. 24.

† See Pp. 27, 28, 29, &c. and particularly Note 12. P. 27.

*apropos des bottes !* what can that Sermon of yours have to do with the Bible Society ? Do you mean to infer that the venerable Institution by which you were then employed, *commissioned* you to preach against the Bible Society ? I thought the theme of your discourse had been purely *Bell versus Lancaster*. Surely I was not mistaken ! Whether this be the case or not, a person writing with the rapidity which I do now, must for the present postpone the consideration of your endeavour to make that Sermon subservient to a cause which you did not *then* avow.

Your pamphlet was published at four o'clock this afternoon, and having read it, I have endeavoured to reply this night to all which concerns me, and the cause wherein I have engaged. I have neither seen nor spoken to a single individual ; but if you choose to consider my sentiments as those of a *Party*, (See Inquiry, p. 7,) you are perfectly at liberty to do so. If I be not mistaken, you have good reason to know that I am by this means associated with company which you would be very proud to keep ; although when you communicated Mr. Vansittart's motive for publishing his Letter, you neglected to inform us that THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN, in consequence of your officious application to him, had written to you, and expressed his UNEQUIVOCAL APPROVAL OF

---

“ Indeed an honour was conferred on this Sermon, *which I believe was without precedent.*” It is not common to hear people talk thus of their own performances.



THE BIBLE SOCIETY. Your giving publicity to this FACT might perhaps, you apprehend, put an end to the cry of "*the danger of the Church,*" and without this *cry*, what becomes of the adversaries of the Bible Society? They would in that case vanish only a little quicker than they will do now. Even as it is, their fate is decided, and *you* have helped to write them down; dosing them with eighty pages of *capitals* and *italics*, which it is impossible they should survive, even if written with *more attention to grammar*,\* and to good Protestant orthodoxy.

Allow me now, Dr. Marsh, to wish you good night, and a speedy conversion to those principles which you before maintained in your higher station as Lecturer in our University Church. So will you be reconciled, not only to me, but to all your Christian brethren; and while even your most intimate friends, those who have withheld their influence from the Bible Society in consequence of your *entreaty*, do not hesitate to consider your opposition to that Society, as tending only to foment *religious*

---

\* When the Edinburgh Reviewers pointed out a *single* violation of Grammar in your Sermon, it might be considered as a casualty. But that the Margaret Professor should break Priscian's head with so small a weapon as his present pamphlet, and almost by every page of it, after it has been *so long* announced, *so deliberately* revised, and after all the changes and modification it has undergone, does indeed somewhat savour of *bad luck* frustrating a *bad cause*. Allow me to refer to the pages; the errors will speak for themselves. See Pp. 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 16, 20, 33, 52, 55, 67, 80, &c. &c. &c.



*dissention*, let me call to your recollection an historical FACT, related in language\* which *you* will read with peculiar complacency, that “the *religious dissentions* in the Greek Empire, by diminishing its strength, prepared its downfall by the Turks: and God grant that the *religious dissentions* among ourselves, which unavoidably produce *dissentions* in the state, may not ultimately effect THE DOWN-FALL OF BRITAIN.”

E. D. CLARKE.

Trumpington, January  
27th, 1812.

---

\* See Course of Lectures, part I. p. 115. Camb, 1809.



P. S.

---

**A**NTICIPATING the celebrity of your present Pamphlet, among persons who will not give themselves the trouble to read a single page of it, and consequently its *industrious circulation*, allow me to hope that some scattered ray emitted from its brilliant focus, may enable your readers to discern this more insignificant production. And if so speedy and so brief a reply to your more *studied performances* shall be read by *Clergymen*, who feel the *wounds* our sacred establishment receives, in being *thus* made a *divided house*; in sustaining an outcry, *thus* excited, that *the Church fears the circulation of the Bible alone*, and finally, who view with disapproval, your *unwise* attempt to make our offers of the Bible to the poor a **CONDITIONAL GIFT**, then a hope is cherished, that reading the List of Orthodox Clergy, who have associated themselves in the Bible Society, and whose zealous attachment to the religion of their country, is not only *conspicuous*, but has *never yet been questioned*, they will refuse to **SURRENDER THEIR CONSCIENCES**, even to *your notions* of **THEIR DUTY**.

